Through McLuhan's Lens

The Efficiency Trap

March 04, 2026 | 2,505 words

THE EFFICIENCY TRAP THROUGH MCLUHAN'S LENS: HOW AI'S PROMISE TO SAVE TIME BLINDS US TO TIME TRANSFORMED

The English professor stares at her screen, crafting the seventh iteration of a prompt for ChatGPT. She needs it to generate discussion questions for tomorrow's class on Victorian literature-a task that once took her twenty minutes of thoughtful reflection. An hour has passed. She's tested different phrasings, evaluated outputs for accuracy, cross-referenced the AI's suggestions with her learning objectives, and added warnings about AI hallucinations to her syllabus. Down the hall, her colleague spends his evening not grading papers but developing rubrics for AI-assisted assignments, creating policies for acceptable AI use, and learning prompt engineering techniques he never knew he'd need. This is the efficiency revolution in higher education: tools that promise to save time creating entirely new categories of academic labor.

Marshall McLuhan would find delicious irony in this scene. The prophet of media ecology warned us decades ago that "the electric light escapes attention as a communication medium just because it has no 'content.'" Similarly, we fixate on what AI produces-the papers it helps write, the questions it generates, the summaries it creates-while remaining blind to how these tools fundamentally restructure the nature of academic work itself. The medium, McLuhan would remind us,

is the message, and AI's true message isn't about efficiency at all. It's about the transformation of scholarly labor into something unrecognizable, even as we measure it with yesterday's stopwatch.

The Medium of Metamorphosis

Through McLuhan's lens, AI tools in higher education reveal themselves not as simple instruments but as environments that reshape everything they touch. "We shape our tools and thereafter they shape us," McLuhan observed, and nowhere is this more evident than in the academy's embrace of artificial intelligence. Faculty who adopt AI assistance for grading find themselves becoming prompt engineers. Those who use it for research discover they've become fact-checkers and output validators. The tool that promised to handle routine tasks has transformed the users into AI supervisors, a role that didn't exist in their job descriptions.

McLuhan would observe that we're experiencing what he called "the ordinary blindness of people to the psychic and social effects of technology." We see AI as a faster typewriter, a more efficient teaching assistant, a tireless grader. But the medium's true message-its reshaping of academic labor-remains invisible. Consider how AI transforms the simple act of creating a quiz. Previously, a faculty member drew upon their expertise to craft questions. Now, they must first conceptualize what they want, translate that into prompts,

generate multiple versions, evaluate each for accuracy and appropriateness, modify prompts based on outputs, check for bias and cultural sensitivity in AI-generated content, and finally adapt the results to their specific context. The "time-saving" tool has created an entirely new workflow.

This transformation extends beyond individual tasks to the very structure of academic departments. IT support staff find themselves teaching prompt engineering. Librarians become AI literacy instructors. Academic advisors must now counsel students not just on course selection but on ethical AI use. McLuhan's insight that "the 'content' of any medium blinds us to the character of the medium" perfectly captures how the promise of efficiency prevents us from seeing these systemic changes.

The Anesthesia of Efficiency

McLuhan warned of "technological numbness," our tendency to become desensitized to the profound changes new media create. "We have become like the most primitive Paleolithic man, once more global wanderers, but information gatherers rather than food gatherers," he wrote. In higher education's AI adoption, the efficiency narrative functions as a particularly powerful anesthetic, numbing us to the surgery being performed on the academic body.

The numbness manifests in peculiar blindnesses. Recent analysis of 1,564 articles about AI in higher education reveals that the "tool frame" dominates discourse while the "partner frame" remains nearly absent. This framing isn't neutral-it's a form of McLuhan's technological numbness. By seeing AI only as a tool for efficiency, we cannot perceive how it's becoming a partner that demands constant attention, negotiation, and accommodation.

McLuhan described our relationship with new technologies as "huge collective surgery carried out on the social body with complete disregard for antiseptics." The efficiency promise serves as the anesthesia that enables this surgery. While administrators celebrate time saved on grading, they don't account for hours spent in emergency faculty meetings about AI policy. While vendors tout automated feedback systems, they don't mention the new emotional labor of explaining to students why they must still learn to write when machines can do it "better." The infection of new work spreads through the academic system, but the efficiency anesthetic keeps us from feeling the pain.

This numbness particularly affects our perception of student experience. Despite AI's profound impact on learning, student voices remain conspicuously absent from policy discussions. McLuhan would recognize this as symptomatic of our technological trance. "The youth of today live mythically and in depth," he observed. "But they encounter instruction in situations organized by means of classified information." Students experience AI not as an efficiency tool but as an environment that fundamentally alters their relationship to knowledge, yet their lived experience remains invisible in efficiency-focused discourse.

The Discourse as Technology

Through McLuhan's framework, the efficiency discourse itself emerges as a technology-a medium with its own message. "Concern with effect rather than meaning is a basic change of our electric time," McLuhan noted, and the AI efficiency narrative exemplifies this perfectly. By framing AI primarily through metrics of time saved and tasks automated, the discourse creates what can and cannot be discussed in academic settings.

This discursive technology privileges certain voices while silencing others. Institutional administrators speak of reduced costs and streamlined operations. Vendors promise unprecedented productivity gains. Faculty who raise concerns about new forms of labor are dismissed as resistant to change. Students who question whether efficiency should be education's primary goal are labeled as nostalgic. McLuhan would observe that the efficiency discourse doesn't just describe reality-it creates a reality where only certain perspectives can be heard.

The medium of efficiency discourse shapes academic labor in three critical ways. First, it makes invisible the emotional work of AI integration. The hours spent calming anxious students who fear their degrees are becoming worthless, the energy expended explaining to parents why their children still need to learn "outdated" skills, the psychological toll of constantly adapting to new tools-none of this registers in efficiency metrics.

Second, the discourse transforms quality concerns into efficiency problems. When faculty worry about AI's impact on critical thinking, the efficiency frame reinterprets this as a need for "better prompts" or "more efficient assessment methods." The medium's message overwrites pedagogical concerns with productivity solutions.

Third, and perhaps most insidiously, efficiency discourse creates what McLuhan might call "the autoamputation of our extended bodies." Just as he argued that the wheel extended our feet and eventually numbed them, AI tools promised to extend our cognitive capacities but may be numbing our awareness of fundamental educational purposes. We become so focused on doing things faster that we forget to ask what we're doing or why.

Through the Rear-View Mirror

"We look at the present through a rear-view mirror," McLuhan famously declared. "We march backwards into the future." Higher education's approach to AI perfectly illustrates this phenomenon. We evaluate artificial intelligence using industrial-age efficiency metrics-time saved, tasks completed, costs reduced-while driving into a landscape where the distinction between human and machine cognition blurs beyond recognition.

The rear-view mirror of efficiency reflects a Taylorist vision of education as information transfer, where faster is always better and standardization equals quality. But AI doesn't simply accelerate existing processes; it fundamentally alters what education might become. McLuhan would observe that

we're like his "man on an electronic bicycle," trying to understand a new medium through the lens of an old one.

This backwards gaze manifests in how we measure AI's impact. We celebrate that students can produce essays in minutes without considering how this transforms the purpose of writing assignments. We applaud AI's ability to provide instant feedback while ignoring how this changes the teacher-student relationship from mentor to prompt engineer. We quantify hours saved on grading without accounting for hours spent managing AI systems, updating policies, and retraining ourselves for jobs that didn't exist last semester.

McLuhan understood that "the undone paper work mounts on each desk" even as electric speed promises efficiency. In academia, the undone work takes new forms: the uncrafted AI policies, the unlearned prompt techniques, the unaddressed ethical questions, the untaught AI literacy skills. The efficiency lens cannot capture this accumulation of new labor because it only sees through the mirror of old categories.

Pattern Recognition in the Academic Field

McLuhan distinguished between "point of view" and "pattern recognition," arguing that electric media demanded the latter. A McLuhanesque reading of AI in higher education reveals patterns invisible to the efficiency-focused point of view. These patterns suggest not just new work but new kinds of workers, new forms of knowledge, and new educational relationships.

The pattern emerges clearly in faculty experiences. The literature professor who once spent her time close-reading texts now spends it close-reading AI outputs. The mathematics instructor who formerly focused on problem sets now debugs AI-generated solutions. The history teacher who specialized in primary sources now specializes in teaching students to verify AI's historical claims. These aren't temporary adjustments but fundamental shifts in professional identity.

Students, too, inhabit new patterns. They become prompt engineers before they become writers, editors of AI output before creators of original thought. The traditional progression from novice to expert collapses when machines can simulate expertise on demand. McLuhan would recognize this as the implosion of sequential learning into simultaneous, pattern-based navigation.

The institutional pattern shifts from hierarchical to networked. Decisions about AI cascade across departments, requiring unprecedented coordination. The writing center must align with computer science, the library with student services, faculty development with IT support. Efficiency metrics capture none of this organizational rewiring, focused as they are on individual productivity rather than systemic transformation.

The Message of Time Transformed

Through McLuhan's lens, the efficiency trap reveals itself as something more profound than simple irony. It's not merely that AI creates more work than it saves-it's that AI transforms the very nature of time in academic life. McLuhan understood that each medium creates its own temporal environment. "Time considered as sequential (left hemisphere) is figure and time considered as simultaneous (right hemisphere) is ground," he wrote.

AI shifts academic work from sequential to simultaneous time. The professor no longer moves through a linear process of preparation, teaching, and assessment. Instead, she exists in a continuous present of prompt crafting, output evaluation, and policy adaptation. The student no longer progresses from ignorance to knowledge but navigates a simultaneous field of AI-generated possibilities. The administrator no longer plans for predictable futures but responds to continuous technological disruption.

This temporal transformation explains why efficiency metrics fail so spectacularly. They measure sequential time-hours saved on Task A-while AI operates in simultaneous time, creating new tasks B through Z that exist in parallel, not sequence. McLuhan would observe that we're trying to clock electric time with mechanical watches.

Beyond the Efficiency Trap

McLuhan offered not just diagnosis but prescription: "There is absolutely no inevitability as long as there is a willingness to contemplate what is happening." For faculty caught in the efficiency trap, contemplation begins with recognizing their own technological numbness. The first step toward AI literacy isn't learning better prompts but seeing how the efficiency discourse itself shapes and limits understanding.

True pattern recognition in AI adoption would acknowledge several uncomfortable truths. First, that efficiency and education may be fundamentally incompatible goals-learning is often inefficient, requiring struggle, confusion, and time-consuming reflection. Second, that AI tools don't eliminate human labor but transform it into new forms we're only beginning to recognize. Third, that the voices excluded from efficiency discourse-particularly students-may hold crucial insights about AI's actual effects on learning.

McLuhan advocated for "a means of perceiving the environment as it really is." In higher education's AI environment, this means seeing beyond productivity metrics to the total field of changes. It means recognizing that every AI tool is also an AI teacher, instructing users in new ways of thinking and being. It means understanding that the promise to save time blinds us to time transformed.

Faculty might develop what McLuhan called an "anti-environment"-a perspective from which to perceive the invisible environment AI creates. This could involve deliberate inefficiency, spaces where AI is forbidden not from fear but for clarity. It might mean valuing contemplation over acceleration, depth over coverage, wisdom over information processing.

The Invisible Revolution

As our English professor finally closes her laptop, having spent three hours on a task that once took twenty minutes,

she embodies McLuhan's insight that "the specialist is one who never makes small mistakes while moving toward the grand fallacy." The grand fallacy of AI efficiency blinds us to a grander truth: we're not saving time but transforming it, not reducing work but revolutionizing it.

McLuhan understood that revolutions happen not through visible upheaval but through invisible environmental change. "Environments are invisible. Their groundrules, pervasive structure, and overall patterns elude easy perception," he wrote. The efficiency trap succeeds precisely because it makes invisible the new environment of academic labor it creates.

The true message of AI as medium isn't efficiency but transformation. It's not about doing the same things faster but about becoming different kinds of academic workers entirely. The professor becomes a prompt engineer, the student an output editor, the institution a continuous beta tester of reality. These changes proceed unmarked by efficiency metrics, invisible to productivity measures, but they reshape the academic enterprise more thoroughly than any visible reform.

Through McLuhan's lens, the path forward requires not better efficiency metrics but better environmental perception. It demands recognition that AI's promise to save time is itself a medium whose message is the transformation of academic temporality. It necessitates understanding that every tool that promises to reduce work is simultaneously creating new categories of labor we don't yet have names for.

The efficiency trap, ultimately, isn't a problem to be solved but a paradox to be understood. McLuhan knew that paradox was the artist's revenge on linear logic, and AI presents higher education with an artistic challenge: to perceive the invisible environment it creates, to recognize the new forms of work it demands, and to value contemplation in an age of acceleration. Only by seeing through the efficiency illusion can we begin to glimpse what AI actually offers-not time saved but time transformed, not work reduced but work reimagined.

In the end, McLuhan would remind us, we become what we behold. If we behold only efficiency metrics, we become efficiency machines. If we can learn to behold the total field of transformation AI brings, we might become something else-pattern recognizers in a new educational environment, conscious participants in our own metamorphosis. The efficiency trap springs not from AI itself but from our blindness to its true message. The escape begins with sight.